UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,322	10/23/2003	Leonardo E. Blanco	MS305624.01	8609

69316 7590 05/14/2008

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052

EXAMINER	
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
05/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,322	BLANCO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 17-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 17-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 01/14/2008. This action is made **Final**.

B. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gershony (US 6,549,218 B1), herein referred to as "Gershony".

As for independent claim 1, Gershony teaches a computer-executable method, comprising: arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows (col.1, lines 48-54; col.8, line 38); providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available

to the parent window to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows (col.6, lines 61-67 and col.7, lines 1-13):
determining if a the child window of a the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality (col.6, lines 14-30);
if so, causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer;
retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer (col.7, line 2); and
applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window (col.7, line 3); and
composing a visual representation of the parent window ~~with the~~ having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window (col.7, lines 4-16).

As for dependent claim 2, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the legacy window is configured to be administered by a legacy display component having fewer visual enhancements than a Media Integration Layer (MIL) component (col.6, lines 14-35; col.7, lines 60-67; col.8, lines 1-12)..

As for dependent claim 3, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 2, wherein causing the child window output to be redirected comprises instructing the legacy display component to redirect the child window output to the off-screen buffer (col.7, line

2).

As for dependent claim 4, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 3, wherein the legacy display component comprises a user subcomponent and a Graphics Device Interface subcomponent (col.7, lines 3-12 and 53-59).

As for dependent claim 5, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises a selected one or more from a group comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, and applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output (col.7, lines 33-59).

As for dependent claim 6, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (col.7, lines 50-59).

As for dependent claim 7, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 2 4-, wherein composing the visual representation of the parent window is performed by the MIL component (col.6, lines 14-35; col.7, lines 60-67; col.8, lines 1-12).

As for independent claim 8, Gershony teaches *a computer-readable medium having, stored thereon, computer-executable instructions which, when executed, direct a computer to perform acts comprising:*
arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows;
providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows: determining if the child window of the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality;
if so, causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer; retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer; and
applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window; and
composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window (note the analysis of claim 1 above).

As for independent claim 17, Gershony teaches an apparatus comprising;."
a processor; and memory storing components executable via the processor~ the components including:
a user component configured to create an off-screen buffer upon detecting the presence of a legacy child window of a parent window;

a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the legacy child window to the off-screen buffer upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window; and a MIL component configured to retrieve the redirected window output from the off-screen buffer and apply a visual enhancement to the redirected window output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device wherein the parent window is configured to: contain a plurality of child windows; support enhanced functionality available through the MIL component; and enable the enhanced functionality available through the MIL component to visually enhance one or more legacy child windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality of the MIL component (note the analysis of claim 1 above and col.6, lines 14-67; col.7, lines 33-59; col.8, lines 13-15 and 24-26).

As for dependent claim 18, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the user component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the legacy child window and its legacy children (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-34).

As for dependent claim 19, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the MIL component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the parent window and its children (col.6, lines 14-35

and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-34).

As for dependent claim 20, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 19, wherein the visual enhancement is at least one of a plurality of visual enhancements comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output, and scaling the legacy child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-12 and 43-67).

As for dependent claim 21, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the MIL component is further configured to interact with the user component and the GDI component to identify a location on a child window of the parent window corresponding to a location of an input event (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-34).

As for independent claim 22, Gershony teaches *a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions stored thereon~ that when executed direct a computer to perform acts comprising: means for redirecting a child window of a parent window to an off-screen buffer responsive to determining that the child window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality, wherein the parent window does*

natively support the enhanced functionality; issuing instructions to notify the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up; retrieving the redirected child window from the off-screen buffer; and applying a visual enhancement to the redirected child window through the enhanced functionality available from the parent window (note the analysis of claim 1 above).

As for dependent claim 23, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 22, wherein the instructions to notify the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is being created (col.6, lines 14-67).

As for dependent claim 24, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 23, wherein the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child window (col.6, lines 14-35 and col.7, lines 17-22).

As for dependent claim 25, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 22, wherein the instructions to notify the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is about to be shown (col.6, lines 14-35).

As for dependent claim 26, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 25, wherein the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child 10 window (col.7, lines 17-32).

(Note:) **It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 17-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
May 8, 2008

/Ba Huynh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179